

Granite Basin (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700566

A. List of Restoration Activities

Restoration Planning Grant funds are requested for the Plumas National Forest (PNF) to perform environmental review for a future project to improve the motorized transportation system in the Granite Basin area. These improvements will include closing roads and trails that have been used extensively by Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) and returning those routes to natural conditions, including land contours and plant communities (road and trail "obliteration"). The environmental review will also include several proposed trail re-locations. The final result of this project would be an improved motorized transportation system in Granite Basin that significantly reduces resource impacts while improving access for members of the public.

No on-the-ground Restoration grant funds are requested at this time. This Restoration grant request covers only environmental review per requirements of the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Project deliverables will include an Environmental Assessment (EA) of effects of the transportation system improvement project (including resource specialist site surveys and reports) and a Decision Memo that documents the chosen project alternative. At least one evaluation for National Register of Historic Places significance will be completed at an inventoried cultural site. A future Restoration grant application would be proposed to fund the route obliterations covered in this NEPA analysis. Other future funding sources would be secured for trail re-locations.

Project Background: The composite road and trail density (miles of route per square mile) values for Granite Basin watersheds are among the highest on the Forest. Such high route densities are usually associated with water quality impacts, including delivery of route-generated sediment to area streams, particularly for watersheds with erosive, decomposed granitic soils such as those found throughout the Granite Basin.

Per national US Forest Service direction, PNF has designed and analyzed, with extensive public input, several Travel Management alternatives to contain the proliferation of routes by restricting all motorized traffic to designated system roads and trails. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Travel Management preferred alternative is due to be signed in spring 2010. Over 1,100 miles of non-system routes have been identified during this NEPA process and many OHV recreationists are interested in adding most of those routes to the PNF motorized trail system. However, field surveys have indicated adverse water quality or other resource impacts along many of these routes that cannot be mitigated in the routes' current locations. The PNF preferred alternative would add approximately 250 miles of new trails to the system. The trails not added to the system include several that are key connector routes that OHV enthusiasts have been enjoying in Granite Basin for many years. To mitigate impacts along these routes, the trails would need to be moved to a new location, such as further away from area stream channels or on slopes that are less severe.

The PNF Travel Management NEPA does not analyze the ground disturbance necessary to obliterate the trails that are not added to the system that are currently causing water quality impacts. Additionally, this NEPA does not analyze ground disturbance necessary to obliterate current system roads that are causing water quality impacts and that are no longer needed for Forest management. Further, the Travel Management NEPA does not analyze ground disturbance that would be necessary to re-locate routes of interest to OHV users to acceptable locations or to convert existing system roads to motorized trails. The Granite Basin Transportation System Improvements (GBTSI) NEPA process will provide a "next step" for the PNF Travel Management effort in that all of these types of actions will be analyzed for Granite Basin watersheds.

A future OHV Restoration grant will be sought by PNF to perform the road and trail obliteration activities identified and authorized through the GBTSI NEPA decision. Funding for any construction of re-located trails or conversion of system roads to trails will be secured from other sources (not OHV Restoration grant) and will likely rely substantially upon volunteer resources from OHV users.

The list of specific roads and trails to be obliterated under the GBTSI NEPA process has not yet been finalized. In summer 2009, dozens of system roads in Granite Basin were surveyed for hydrologic impacts and OHV recreationists assisted with identifying priority trails and proposed re-locations. Development of the proposed action for the GBTSI project will continue in 2010, again using PNF funds. The GBTSI proposed action is scheduled to be finalized in late fall 2010, prior to

beginning the NEPA analysis proposed under this grant. The proposed action will not be finalized until after the PNF Travel Management ROD is implemented.

B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

As described above, Granite Basin is a popular destination and high-use area for OHV enthusiasts, including single-track riders, jeep and ATV four-wheelers, and campers. This restoration planning effort will analyze significant restoration actions as well as actions to improve OHV opportunities. For example, this restoration NEPA will allow a closer look at several undeveloped campsites that have been enjoyed by OHVs in the past but were not reviewed under the Travel Management NEPA, potentially resulting in restoration of sites that are impacting Forest resources and improved access to campsites that are not impacting resources. Additionally, the viability of a few small play areas and trials-riding opportunities along designated trails will potentially be analyzed. See attached letters of support from Paradise Ridge Riders, Ironman Dual Sport and Sierra Access Coalition.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

The GBTSI project area is comprised of three watersheds that drain to the Little North Fork of the Middle Fork Feather River. The total area for these watersheds is 26,000 acres (40.7 square miles). As described above, development of the proposed action for the GBTSI project is ongoing and the precise number of roads and trails to be obliterated is currently unknown. Forest mapping data indicates that approximately 210 miles of system and non-system roads and trails exist within these Granite Basin watersheds. Preliminary estimates indicate that roughly 20-50 miles of system road and 10-15 miles of non-system routes will be proposed for obliteration in the GBTSI NEPA process. These figures are subject to change as the proposed action is developed in 2010.

Several system road or non-system trails will be re-located such that Forest resources are not adversely impacted. Several system roads decommissioned in the past are of interest to OHV users as trails and these routes will be considered for road-to-trail actions if trails can be constructed and used without adverse effects to Forest resources.

The attached map shows the project watershed boundaries, prominent streams, and the approximately 210 miles of system and non-system roads and trails that exist within the Granite Basin watersheds. A second map gives a closer view of the watershed with the highest route density, the Upper Little North Fork watershed.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Not applicable to Restoration Planning projects.

E. List of Reports

- Draft and Final Environmental Assessment documents for the GBTSI proposed action
- Field surveys and resource reports by PNF specialists for wildlife, botany, archaeology, watershed, recreation, and forestry
- A Decision Memo for the selected GBTSI project alternative
- At least one evaluation for National Register of Historic Places significance

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

The area will be patrolled by both Law Enforcement and Forest Protection Officers.

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700566

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Granite Basin](#)

[Granite Basin 2](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Granite Basin](#)

[Letter of support](#)

[Letter of support](#)

[Letter of support](#)

Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Plumas National Forest		
PROJECT TITLE :	Granite Basin (FINAL)	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	G09-02-13-R04
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>Restoration Planning Grant funds are requested for the Plumas National Forest (PNF) to perform environmental review for a future project to improve the motorized transportation system in the Granite Basin area. These improvements will include closing roads and trails that have been used extensively by Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) and returning those routes to natural conditions, including land contours and plant communities (road and trail "obliteration"). The environmental review will also include several proposed trail re-locations. The final result of this project would be an improved motorized transportation system in Granite Basin that significantly reduces resource impacts while improving access for members of the public.</p> <p>No on-the-ground Restoration grant funds are requested at this time. This Restoration grant request covers only environmental review per requirements of the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Project deliverables will include an Environmental Assessment (EA) of effects of the transportation system improvement project (including resource specialist site surveys and reports) and a Decision Memo that documents the chosen project alternative. At least one evaluation for National Register of Historic Places significance will be completed at an inventoried cultural site. A future Restoration grant application would be proposed to fund the route obliterations covered in this NEPA analysis. Other future funding sources would be secured for trail re-locations.</p> <p>Project Background: The composite road and trail density (miles of route per square mile) values for Granite Basin watersheds are among the highest on the Forest. Such high route densities are usually associated with water quality impacts, including delivery of route-generated sediment to area streams, particularly for watersheds with erosive, decomposed granitic soils such as those found throughout the Granite Basin.</p> <p>Per national US Forest Service direction, PNF has designed and analyzed, with extensive public input, several Travel Management alternatives to contain the proliferation of routes by restricting all motorized traffic to designated system roads and trails. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Travel Management preferred alternative is due to be signed in spring 2010. Over 1,100 miles of non-system routes have been identified during this NEPA process and many OHV recreationists are interested in adding most of those routes to the PNF motorized trail system. However, field surveys have indicated adverse water quality or other resource impacts along many of these routes that cannot be mitigated in the routes' current locations. The PNF preferred alternative would add approximately 250 miles of new trails to the system. The trails not added to the system include several that are key connector routes that OHV enthusiasts have been enjoying in Granite Basin for many years. To mitigate impacts along these routes, the trails would need to be moved to a new location, such as further away from area stream channels or on slopes that are less severe.</p> <p>The PNF Travel Management NEPA does not analyze the ground disturbance necessary to obliterate the trails that are not added to the system that are currently causing water quality impacts. Additionally, this NEPA does not analyze ground disturbance necessary to obliterate current system roads that are causing water quality impacts and that are no longer needed for Forest management. Further, the Travel Management NEPA does not analyze ground disturbance that would be necessary to re-locate routes of interest to OHV users to acceptable locations or to convert existing system roads to motorized trails. The Granite Basin Transportation System Improvements (GBTSI) NEPA process will provide a "next step" for the PNF Travel Management effort in that all of these types of actions will be analyzed for Granite Basin watersheds.</p> <p>A future OHV Restoration grant will be sought by PNF to perform the road and trail obliteration activities identified and authorized through the GBTSI NEPA decision. Funding for any construction of re-located trails or conversion of system roads to trails will be secured from other sources (not OHV Restoration grant) and will likely rely substantially upon volunteer resources from OHV users.</p> <p>The list of specific roads and trails to be obliterated under the GBTSI NEPA process has not yet been finalized. In summer 2009, dozens of system roads</p>		

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: USFS - Plumas National Forest
Application: Granite Basin (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	in Granite Basin were surveyed for hydrologic impacts and OHV recreationists assisted with identifying priority trails and proposed re-locations. Development of the proposed action for the GBTSI project will continue in 2010, again using PNF funds. The GBTSI proposed action is scheduled to be finalized in late fall 2010, prior to beginning the NEPA analysis proposed under this grant. The proposed action will not be finalized until after the PNF Travel Management ROD is implemented.
--	--

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Other-NEPA Planner	30.000	350.000	DAY	10,500.00	0.00	10,500.00
	Other-Hydrologist	40.000	300.000	DAY	5,500.00	6,500.00	12,000.00
	Other-Watershed Program Mgr	20.000	420.000	DAY	0.00	8,400.00	8,400.00
	Other-Recreation Program Mgr	20.000	350.000	DAY	0.00	7,000.00	7,000.00
	Other-Recreation Tech	30.000	200.000	DAY	6,000.00	0.00	6,000.00
	Botanist	30.000	350.000	DAY	10,500.00	0.00	10,500.00
	Archeologist	80.000	325.000	DAY	26,000.00	0.00	26,000.00
	Other-Wildlife Biologist	30.000	300.000	DAY	9,000.00	0.00	9,000.00
	Other-Forester	15.000	375.000	DAY	5,625.00	0.00	5,625.00
	Other-Fire/Fules	15.000	300.000	DAY	4,500.00	0.00	4,500.00
	Other-Transportation Planner	10.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
	Other-Road Engineer	5.000	300.000	DAY	0.00	1,500.00	1,500.00
	Other-Archaeologist Tech	50.000	210.000	DAY	10,500.00	0.00	10,500.00
	Total for Staff				88,125.00	27,400.00	115,525.00
2	Contracts						
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Other-Archaeology	1.000	300.000	EA	0.00	300.00	300.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: USFS - Plumas National Forest
Application: Granite Basin (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
	Other-Pickup Mileage	6000.000	0.300	MI	0.00	1,800.00	0.00
	Other-FOR	1650.000	1.000	EA	0.00	1,650.00	1,650.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				0.00	3,450.00	1,650.00
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Indirect Costs						
Total Program Expenses					88,125.00	31,150.00	117,475.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					88,125.00	31,150.00	117,475.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					88,125.00	31,150.00	117,475.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
 Agency: USFS - Plumas National Forest
 Application: Granite Basin (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	88,125.00	27,400.00	115,525.00	
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	0.00	300.00	300.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	3,450.00	1,650.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Program Expenses		88,125.00	31,150.00	117,475.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		88,125.00	31,150.00	117,475.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		88,125.00	31,150.00	117,475.00	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700566

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

No impact to Wetlands, or navigable waters has been identified or documented. Trail maintenance included as part of the Plumas NF OHV program includes use of heavy machinery and hand tools. Signing and route designation will focus use on roads and trails in order to minimize impacts to wetlands. Navigable waters are not impacted by this project. Law enforcement patrols and use of vehicle barriers will further limit intrusion into sensitive areas. Maps included as part of the Wildlife Habitat Protection Program (WHPP) show locations of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species habitat, in relation to summer OHV routes. All routes are monitored for impacts on wetlands, navigable waters and sensitive habitats. All monitoring activities are recorded and the data is used in development for the grant application and requests are made for funding to accomplish conservation activities, repair or maintenance of these routes or areas to ensure that resource damage does not occur. Level I-III roads and trails are maintained and brought up to "green" standards by FS Road Maintenance Crews. Forest wildlife biologists have indicated that continued signing, management, and monitoring of the OHV use will prevent impact to wetlands and sensitive species habitats.

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

The Forest has not identified areas of cumulative impacts where managed OHV activities have occurred in the same place over the years due to OHV use or maintenance.

Maintenance of OHV routes using State and Federal funds includes maintenance by the use of all types of equipment or hand tools. Drainage devices such as water bars and rolling dips will be installed on 4x4 trails will be maintained, generally by Forest Service and volunteers through the Adopt-A-Trail program. All routes will be patrolled, and drainage devices with a noticeable need for maintenance will be maintained. At this time, additional critical resource protection is not anticipated.

The Forest, will respond to soil loss monitoring reports from 2006, by submitting funding requests for resource protection as part of a grant request. No cumulative impacts are expected from doing routine maintenance. However, not conducting this maintenance may result in soil erosion. Not conducting maintenance will likely result in fewer OHV routes being in compliance with soil loss standards, and eventually result in the closure of routes.

Widening of trails is not a concern, as the majority of OHV routes are located on level II roads, and trails are maintained to designated width. Signing and vehicle barriers are used to keep vehicle travel on the trail, and to prevent trail widening.

With the trail network that exists, i.e. spread across the Plumas NF, noise and dust issues have been an issue.

No direct cumulative impacts have been documented or noted in our current Land Management plan as related to noise, increased traffic or dust etc.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

Where managed OHV use occurs, no significant effect on the environment is caused due to unusual circumstances such as steep slopes or erodible soils. The Forest has re-routed trails to avoid these types of situations or accomplished trail maintenance, which is repeated as necessary. Currently there is no cross country travel on the Plumas NF, all OHV use must occur on existing roads and trails.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

No damage to the scenic resources has been documented through our monitoring efforts. While a state scenic highway traverse the Plumas NF, (St. Rte. 70) no impacts to the scenic viewshed have occurred to this highway from OHV activities. OHV routes are not in the immediate vicinity of HWY 70 and cannot be seen from HWY 70.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

There will be no substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

No potential exists for the project to cause indirect significant impacts by causing user groups to go elsewhere, or significantly increasing use in the vicinity of the project. Trail maintenance will enhance and sustain the OHV opportunity Forest wide.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700566

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 17

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)
☒ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [3]
☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
☒ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [3]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

Decommissioning of several routes will protect archaeological and historical sites by preventing motorized traffic through these sites. Obliteration, re-vegetation, and restoration of natural drainage patterns along routes will stabilize the highly erosive decomposed granite soils. Route obliteration activities will effectively prevent chronic sedimentation, resulting in significant water quality and aquatic habitat improvements. Water quality improvements, as well as prevention of local disturbances due to motorized traffic, will benefit several sensitive areas, including Protected Activity Centers (PACs) for Goshawk and CA Spotted Owl, adjacent wetlands, stream courses, ponds, and riparian areas. The Little North Fork is a high-quality, prominent tributary to the Middle Fork Feather River, the first Wild and Scenic River designated in California. Forest-designated special status species that will benefit include Goshawk and CA Spotted Owl, and Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
☐ Management decision (1 point)

- ☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

As described above, motorized route densities, including system roads and non-system OHV routes, in Granite Basin watersheds are the highest on the Forest and many of these routes are chronic sources of fine sediment to area streams. Upon implementation of this project, soil stability and natural drainage patterns will be restored for significant portions of these watersheds. Additionally, trail re-locations and road-to-trail actions associated with this planning grant will result in improved access for Forest recreationists, miners, and other members of the public. The travel management record of decision document when signed is the reference document.

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☒ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Obliteration implementation will include site monitoring to assure that constructed barriers and other devices used to control traffic are effective in preventing damage to the restored areas. Only certified weed-free mulches will be utilized and standard Forest measures will be incorporated to prevent introduction of invasive plant species. Seeding will be comprised of native species and soil stabilization will facilitate the re-establishment of native plants. Obliteration activities will be conducted per the Forest's Best Management Practices, certified by the CA State Water Resources Control Board. Educational signage will be incorporated during implementation to inform Forest recreationists of the changes to the motorized system and the benefits of the restoration activities. Re-location of several OHV routes is expected in Granite Basin. In several locations, potential alternate routes already exist. Re-located routes will provide assurance that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored areas.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points)
- ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

This project is supported by the goals, policies, standards and guidelines presented in the 1988 Forest LRMP, the regional 2004 SNFPA, and the PNF Travel Management decision (to be signed in spring 2010). All of these planning documents had extensive public review.

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)

- ☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ☐ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

After project implementation, monitoring and maintenance of restored sites will primarily be the responsibility of PNF, with occasional assistance from recreation user groups. The Forest Service Appropriations budget signed by the President of the United States, will be used for the implementation and maintenance of these sites.

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- ☒ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- ☐ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

Further calls and office and field visits will occur this year with interested recreation users to develop the proposed action for the GBTSI EA. Public meetings, will be advertised to the general public in the newspaper of record the Feather River Bulletin and the Oroville Mercury Register, will be part of the GBTSI NEPA process to be funded by this grant.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points)
- ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)
- ☐ 1 (1 point)
- ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Partner organizations involved in this project to date include Paradise Ridge Riders, Ironman Dual Sport, Sierra Access Coalition, CA 4WD Association, and Ophir Gopher Jeep Club. See attached letters of support from some of these organizations.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will 6

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
- ☒ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
- ☒ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
- ☒ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

Field investigations and reports from PNF resource specialists, including watershed, wildlife, recreation, cultural, silviculture and botany specialists, will be used to determine appropriate route locations and obliteration techniques and methods and analyze restoration effects. This multi-discipline effort will lead to a NEPA decision which directs meaningful on-the-ground management action and will ensure success of the restoration project.

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

The Integrated Regional Water Management Plan for the Upper Feather River watershed (2005) identifies the reduction of sediment problems associated with roads and trails as being the key watershed restoration activity for PNF.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)

☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)

☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)

☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)